IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

TUESDAY, THE 6TH MARCH 2007 / 15TH PHALGUNA 1928

RP.No. 44 of 2007(B)

(JUDGEMENT IN WPC.33654/2003 Dated 11/12/2006)

.....

PETITIONER

N.RAJASEKHARAN NAIR,
SOUTH OVER BRIDGE, M.G.ROAD,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE POONTHOTTAM
SRI.J.JAYAKUMAR
SRI.N.R.SURESHKUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE CORPORATION OF THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. ARASI VIJAYAKUMAR,
'DHRUVAM', THIRUVALLOM P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R1 BY ADV.SRI.N.NANDAKUMARA MENON, SC
R2 BY ADV.SRI.P.GOPALAKRISHNAN NAIR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:-

PIUS C. KURIAKOSE, J.

.....

R.P.NO.44 OF 2007 IN
W.P.(C) No.33654 OF 2003

.....

DATED THIS THE 6TH MARCH, 2007

O R D E R

The petitioner in W.P.(C)No.33654 of 2003 seeks review of my judgment dated 11.12.2006 by which I had dismissed the Writ Petition. One of the reasons which weighed with me for dismissing the Writ Petition was the decision which I had taken in a connected matter, W.P.(C)No.27946 of 2003. I had also noticed that there was merit in the contention of the 2nd respondent in the Writ Petition (2nd respondent in the present Review Petition) that an earlier Writ Petition (W.P.(C)No.31733 of 2003) filed by the petitioner was unconditionally withdrawn and therefore the present Writ Petition is not maintainable.

2. Even though Mr.George Poonthottam, learned counsel for the petitioner addressed me elaborately, I am of the view that having regard to the narrow contours of jurisdiction for review, there is no warrant for reviewing my earlier judgment. The Review Petition will stand dismissed.

(PIUS C. KURIAKOSE, JUDGE)

tgl